

Forest Practice Biomass Workgroup

Wednesday, November 30, 2011

Room 175, Natural Resource Building

Olympia, Washington

8AM – Noon

MEETING NOTES

General Process Input:

- Should we make our March/April meetings longer or add more meetings to ensure we have adequate time to return to our “Flagged” items?
- **TO DO: Bridget and Rachael will propose a way to do this with a preference for longer meetings instead of additional meetings.**

Question related removal of small materials from the RMZ:

- Can't use equipment to remove materials. Any small materials that are removed from the RMZ will need to be done so with hands.

Discussion Topic: Soil Productivity

FLAGGED Item:

1. FP rules only require mitigation for soil disturbance of >10% inside Equipment Limitation Zone (ELZ) of Type N waters. Should this be expanded to address more of the landscape?

Discussion Topic: Dead wood, slash disposal, carbon storage

FLAGGED Items:

1. Timing. 60 days requirement to remove slash post timber harvest could pose an issue for biomass collection. WAC 222-30-080
 - a. If plans for removal are described in the Forest Practices application, intent of this requirement will be met. Must be explicit in application (can't negatively affect resources, roads might be an issue).
 - i. Need to cure biomass is not an excuse to hold off reforestation and/or risk resource damage.
 - b. WAC 222-16-010 “Completion of Harvest.” What happens if timber contract is independent of biomass contractor. How do we address situations where two kinds of harvests are decoupled?
 - i. Possibly not enough time in the 6-month window.
2. Is our group goal/intent to create broad goals like other states or more specific goals (site index) with regard to dead/down wood and retention levels (volumes)?
3. WRT/GRT requirements were last updated in 1992, need to determine if they need to be updated.
4. Rules lack retention targets for fine woody debris, need to determine if they need to be updated to include fine woody debris.
5. If retaining soil carbon based on biomass is equal to keeping more biomass on the ground, the trade off diminished opportunity for production of renewable fuels and energy.
 - a. What is the analytical boundary of this group? Need to stay focused on the FP Act/rules.
6. We can't currently determine the efficacy of the existing FP rules with regard to dead wood and slash disposal.
7. There are no FP rules related to carbon storage.

- a. Group could form a goal. Example: no net loss.
 - b. Group could look at whether carbon is being sequestered adequately as a result of meeting other goals already articulated in the FP rules.
 - c. What timeframe and scale is appropriate for this inquiry?
 - d. Carbon is not covered in the RCW, though it's still important to other elements of ecosystem health – regeneration, wildlife habitat, etc.
8. Does coarse woody debris include stumps?
- a. Need to look into definitions section.
 - b. Might need to clarify that stumps can't be taken in a guidance document. Do stumps count toward contributing to ecological requirements?

TO DO: Rachael will look into BMPs and Forest Practice rules in other states (FP rules only, BMP's only, FP rules and BMP's).